



**Town of Arlington, Massachusetts**  
**730 Massachusetts Ave., Arlington, MA 02476**  
**Phone: 781-316-3000**

**webmaster@town.arlington.ma.us**

## Symmes Neighborhood Advisory Committee Minutes 02/28/2005

### MINUTES

#### SYMMES NEIGHBORHOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SNAC)

MEETING of February 28, 2005 ; Town Hall Annex, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room

SNAC MEMBERS PRESENT (alphabetical order): Sandi Bourgeois, Terry Dash (Chair), Elaine Duffy, Greg Jackmauh, Paul Morrison.

OTHERS: Tom Murray; Elisabeth Carr-Jones

7:00pm Call to Order.

- . . . . . Terry hands out a packet of information; included is a draft of a SNAC Transportation Survey that she and Sandi created.
- Terry notes that the use of a survey for traffic issues is similar to the effort made to get input from the neighbors about the Neighborhood protection Plan (NPP). For the latter, SNAC held a meeting that focused on the NPP after having made a specific invitation to neighbors to come.
- Sandi says that the survey fits with SNAC's charge. Further, she says that more neighborhood input is needed on the various traffic issues; also, by sending out a survey, there can be additional information included that provides other updates.
- Greg says that the survey/ mailing gives the neighbors a chance to voice their issues.
- Paul notes that SNAC has not yet done a comprehensive review of traffic issues, due to the focus on getting the NPP moved along. So, SNAC needs to air the various issues itself. He notes that Terry, Sandi and Elaine have been attending the Transportation Advisory Committee's Symmes Transportation Subcommittee (STS) meetings. Thus, they would have a good sense of the traffic issues as discussed by the STS. Thus, if we were to begin to review specific traffic related tasks being worked on by STS, they could assist the full group in getting caught up.
- Terry notes that TAC STS would be interested in feedback from the SNAC; and that actually, they would like to have something for March 8.
- Elisabeth notes that these traffic issues are difficult issues because they are inter-related.

7:30 We review the draft of the Transportation Survey and related issues.

- Paul comments on being against the right turn pocket – that it adds to the expanse of tar and road which negatively impacts the neighborhood feel; also the pocket creates three lanes in front of residents' homes. He comments that it could be over-engineering the intersection; and that it would interfere with parking for the convenience store.
- Elaine is concerned for the removal of trees, and the impact on neighbors.
- Elizabeth brings a drawing for a right lane pocket that is set-back from Summer street.

7:40 We note that the Public Special Permit hearings could be late March.

- We raise the question of what are we going to do? Should we have a neighbors' meeting.
- Elisabeth notes that the public needs to know the transportation issues before the Special Permit process; and maybe needs an update on the process itself.
- We propose that the Survey go out to the neighbors in a week, if permit hearings are the end of March – so we can get responses back and assemble them for presentation to the ARB.
- Elisabeth notes that the STS has a meeting early March and will be trying to finalize its transportation recommendations. She says the STS will not have time to assist in the survey. But, she will be glad to send it around to the STS to get some comment on it.
- . . . . . SNAC members will email survey comments to Terry.
- . . . . . Terry will email survey to STS for their comments.
- Maybe we can get the survey out on the 11<sup>th</sup> of March.
- . . . . . We will email each other times/dates for a meeting with neighbors.
- . . . . . We will draft other Intro materials for the mailing to go along with the survey.

7:49 Tom Murray arrives.

- . . . . . He hands out a proposal to the town for his services in helping with the NPP
- We receive Terry's SNAC summary to be given to the ARB.
- Greg suggests that with Tom acting with us in the NPP drafting process, there might be more willingness for SRA/Fish to cooperate. For example, they might be more quick to come to a range of solutions/mitigations for the on-site rock processing.
- Tom notes that Fish very likely has a good sense of their plan to work on the site. But, they are hesitant to share that plan.
- Tom suggests why not have them put together a 3-5 year plan on paper for the neighbors.
- Tom notes that Fish could decide on where the crushing might happen for the duration, and place it such that it has the least impact on the neighbors.
- He recalls for us the idea of having an acoustical consultant and how that could help for identifying hot spots for noise; and monitoring as the work goes along.
- Fish could do a phase plan to share with us as part of the NPP.

- Greg asks if there is a cycle of work proposed, i.e. work/noise; move; work/ noise; move; etc? Perhaps if we have an idea of when various activities happen, we can limit the negative impact.
- Tom notes that sound can be addressed in part by the use of a fence and sound blanket.
- Paul asks about no work on Saturdays, or making a limit to no two Saturdays in a row. Tom poses that this can be hard to get such restrictions up front. He says that developers are often deterred from working weekends because of the expense. He suggests it will be hard to get specific wording.
- Greg asks about where is truck queuing. Tom Murray said there could be approximately 150 workers on the site.

We adjourn to attend the ARB meeting where Terry will summarize SNAC activities to date; and Tom's proposal to consult will be put forward for approval.

8:12 pm Adjourn.

~

Draft Minutes for Review: Submitted – Paul Morrison 3/25/05